

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
5 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**
6

7 JANE DOE 1, ET AL.,
8 Plaintiffs,

9 v.

10 KIRSTJEN NIELSEN, et al.,
11 Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-02349-BLF](#)

**ORDER DENYING OPPOSED
MOTION TO STAY REMAINING
MOTION TO DISMISS DEADLINES**

[Re: ECF 117]

12
13 In the present motion, Defendants request that the Court stay the deadline for them to reply
14 to Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss and to reset the hearing on Defendants'
15 motion to dismiss until "at least two weeks after the jurisdictional discovery period closes." *See*
16 ECF 117. This motion is DENIED. Because Defendants recognize that the results of
17 jurisdictional discovery are "intricately linked and fundamental to resolution of the claims
18 Defendants raised in their dismissal motion," Mot. at 2, the appropriate course of action is for
19 Defendants to withdraw their pending motion to dismiss and refile it after the conclusion of the
20 jurisdictional discovery period and to stipulate with Plaintiffs that a motion to dismiss at that time
21 would be timely filed under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
22

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**
24

25 Dated: October 17, 2018

26 

27 BETH LABSON FREEMAN
28 United States District Judge